

## REMARKS

Claims 1-14 were previously pending in the current application. As noted above, claims 1, 5-9 and 12-14 have been amended, and claims 15-27 have been added. Support for these amendments may be found throughout the Specification and original claims. Thus, claims 1-27 are now pending in the current application.

Further, Applicants believe that in light of the remarks presented herein, the present application is in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request prompt and favorable action.

### *Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102*

Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bibr et al. (US Published Patent Application No. 2005/0057560). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants note that the Bibr reference filing date is March 1, 2004. Further, the pending application has an “invention date” corresponding to the foreign filing priority date of February 19, 2004, of the corresponding UK application number 0403709.9. *See*, MPEP 1893.03(b). Thus, Bibr does not qualify as prior art under 35 USC § 102(e).

Additionally, it is noted that provisional application number 60/503,982, filed September 17, 2003, from which Bibr claims priority, is not an “application for patent” under 35 USC § 102(e). Thus, provisional application number 60/503,982, from which Bibr claims priority, is not relevant to a rejection under 35 USC § 102(e).

Further, for the sake of argument, the provisional application number 60/503,982 filed September 17, 2003, from which Bibr claims priority, does not provide support for the Figures cited by the Examiner against the current application. Specifically, neither Fig. 7 nor Fig. 11 finds support in the above cited provisional application.

For the sake of argument, even if one were to assume support may be found in provisional application 60/503,982, Bibr neither discloses nor suggests the claimed subject matter.

For a prior art reference to anticipate, 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that “each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950 (Fed. Cir.

1999) (quoting *Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)).

Independent claim 1 recites, in part, “receiving content data for a user interface from a communications interface.” The Official Action asserts that Bibr teaches the claimed subject matter and cites Fig. 7, elements 1002 and 1003, and paragraph [0005] as support.

Contrary to the Official Action’s assertions, Fig. 7, elements 1002 and 1003 neither disclose nor suggest the claimed subject matter. The description accompanying Fig. 7 elements 1002 and 1003 (referenced as 702 and 703 in Bibr) discloses that “operation 700 shows data input 702 for an action, such as pushing a button or selecting a menu item, which the user performed 703 *on a user-interface* element through the user interface 202.” See. e.g. Bibr, paragraph [0087] (Emphasis added). Such a disclosure, however, does not teach or suggest the claimed subject matter, which recites “receiving content data *for a user interface from a communications interface*.” In other words, the claimed subject matter recites receiving content data from a communication interface, such as a network interface, and providing said content data to a user interface, while the cited reference teaches receiving an input by a user on a user interface. Thus, even if Bibr were available as prior art, Bibr neither discloses nor suggests the claimed subject matter.

Therefore, based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1 and 9 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bibr.

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103***

Claims 2-8 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Bibr in view of Ramos et al. (WO 01/61508 A1), hereinafter “Ramos.” Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, all of the claimed features must be taught or suggested by the references and there must be some suggestion or motivation, in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. MPEP, section 2142.

As noted above, Bibr does not qualify as prior art, and the addition of Ramos fails to disclose or suggest all of the recited subject matter. Further, even if Bibr were available as prior

art, Ramos fails to cure the above-discussed deficiencies in Bibr. Specifically, Ramos is silent with respect to "receiving content data for a user interface from a communications interface," as is recited in the claimed subject matter.

Therefore, based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-8 and 10-14 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Bibr in view of Ramos.

#### *New Claims*

Applicants have added new claims 15-27 to recite subject matter to which they are entitled. As noted above, these new claims are fully supported throughout the Specification.

Additionally, claims 15-27 are allowable, as there is no combination of the cited references that discloses or suggests the subject matter recited by these claims.

In particular, claims 15-20 respectively depend from independent claim 8, which is believed to be patentable over any combination of the cited references, as discussed above.

Further, independent claim 21 recites subject matter similar to that of independent claims 1, 8 and 9, and thus is allowable for at least the same reasons. Claims 22-27 are also non-obvious and patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art references for at least the same reasons, as they depend from independent claim 21. Further, each of claims 15-20 and 22-27 separately recites subject matter not disclosed or suggested by any combination of the cited references. Also, it is noted that claims 15-20 and 22-27 recite subject matter similar to claims 2-7.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow claims 15-27.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the remarks contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 26, 2010

By: 

Nicholas A. Cole  
Reg. No. 60,957  
(858) 658-1834

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
Attn: Patent Department  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121-1714  
Telephone: (858) 658-1834  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502